

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-23, 32 and 33 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8-11, 23 and 32 have been amended and claims 35-37 have been added by the present Amendment. Amended claims 1, 8-11, 23 and 32 do not introduce any new subject matter.

Claims 7, 16, 22 and 33 have been canceled without prejudice by the present Amendment.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 7-10, 18, 19, 22 and 23.

The Examiner objects to claims 7-10, 18, 19 and 22-23 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, and indicates that claims 7-10, 18, 19 and 22-23 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base and any intervening claims.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the Examiner's objection to claims 7-10, 18, 19 and 22-23 as being dependent upon rejected base claims.

In response to the Examiner's objection, to place the application in condition for allowance, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 11 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claims 7 and 22, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectively submit that claims 1 and 11 are allowable over the cited reference.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 11 and claims 8-10 and claims 18, 19 and 23 respectively dependent thereon are in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to

claims 7-10, 18, 19 and 22-23.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-5, 11-14, 17, 20, 21 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0136065 ("Messenger"), claims 16 and 33 having been canceled.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Claims 1-5

As stated above, to place the application in condition for allowance, Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit, that for at least the reason of the amendment to claim 1, claim 1 and claims 2-5 dependent thereon are not anticipated by Messenger and are in condition for allowance.

As such, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and that claims 1-5 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 11-14, 17 and 20-21

As stated above, to place the application in condition for allowance, Applicants have amended claim 11 to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 22.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit, that for at least the reason of the amendment to claim 11, claim 11 and claims 12-14, 17 and 20-21 dependent thereon are not anticipated by Messenger and are in condition for allowance.

As such, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 11-14, 17 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and that claims 11-14, 17 and 20-21 are in condition for allowance, claim 16 having been canceled.

Claim 32

Applicants respectfully submit that Messenger does not disclose or suggest inverting the active signal to generate an inverted active signal, inactivating the second driving signal in response to the inverted active signal, and comparing the divided voltage to the reference voltage for activating the second driving signal when the divided voltage is less than the reference voltage and for inactivating the second driving signal when the divided voltage is greater than the reference voltage, as recited in amended claim 32. These features are neither expressly nor inherently disclosed or suggested in Messenger.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 32, as amended, is not anticipated by Messenger.

As such, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and that claim 32 is in condition for allowance, claim 33 having been canceled.

NEW CLAIMS

Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 35-37 are patentable over the cited reference for at least the reason that new claims 35-37 depend from allowable

claims 1 or 11.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 35-37 are in condition for allowance.

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicants' Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael F. Morano", is written over a horizontal line.

Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
(516) 692-8888